

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,601	09/12/2003	R. Donald Grafton	A8130.0153/P153	7642
24998 DICKSTEIN S	7590 01/06/200 HAPIRO LLP	EXAMINER		
1825 EYE STR		RYCKMAN, MELISSA K		
Washington, DC 20006-5403			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3773	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	10/660,601	GRAFTON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAILING DATE of this communication communication	MELISSA RYCKMAN	3773				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	J. nety filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 Oe</u>	<u>ctober 2008</u> .					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-6,8-14 and 16-19 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6,8-14 and 16-19 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11). The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicativity documents have been received in PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachmont/c)						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte				

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to claims filed 10/8/08.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jenkins, Jr. (US 5571139) in view of Grafton et al. (US 5964783).

Jenkins Jr. teaches a suture anchor (1) comprising:

- a bioabsorbable (Column 3, proximate line 42) anchor body (13) having a proximal end and a distal end; and a suture eyelet (27 or 28) formed of a strand of suture (it is noted that knot 27 comprises a suture eyelet), the suture eyelet can receive a second, knot-tying suture therethrough (Fig. 3C, eyelet that is part of knot 27 is capable receiving the second suture 30) of the suture eyelet being disposed completely within the anchor body (Fig. 3c, there are two sutures and multiple suture eyelets)
- wherein the suture anchor has a predetermined length and wherein the suture eyelet (28) is recessed from the proximal end of the anchor body by about one third of the predetermined length (fig. 3b)

- wherein the anchor body is provided with a drive socket (31) and the suture eyelet is disposed within the drive socket (fig. 3b)
- comprising a strand of a knot tying suture threaded through the suture eyelet (it is noted that the non-loop portion of the knot 27 or 28 is a strand of knot tying suture)
- wherein the anchor body is treaded from the proximal end to the distal end (fig.
 1)
- wherein the anchor body has a constant outer diameter and a tapered inner diameter (fig. 2)
- the suture loop is a suture eyelet (28, when the loop is formed, there is an eyelet for the suture to pass through)

Jenkins Jr. fails to teach wherein the suture eyelet is insert-molded into the anchor body. Grafton teaches a suture anchor wherein a suture material is insert molded into the anchor body in order to increase pull out strength of the suture from the anchor body. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Jenkins Jr. with an insert-molded suture loop in order to increase pull out strength of the suture from the anchor body.

Claims 10, 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Jenkens Jr. and Grafton (5964783) and further in view of Grafton et al. (US 6319270).

The combination of Jenkens Jr. and Grafton (5964783) teaches all limitations of previous dependent claims 1, 9, 11, and 17 as previously described, but fails to teach wherein the anchor body has a constant outer diameter and a stepped tapered inner diameter and wherein the anchor thread extending between the proximal end and the distal end of the body has a crest which tapers from wide to narrow from the proximal end to the distal end of the body.

Page 4

Grafton (6319270) teaches a suture anchor wherein the anchor body has a constant outer diameter and a stepped tapered inner diameter and wherein the anchor thread extending between the proximal end and the distal end of the body has a crest which tapers from wide to narrow from the proximal end to the distal end of the body in order to provide an increased percentage of thread surface area for each turn of the anchor, thus providing increased pull-out strength, and a decreased tendency for back-out (Column 2, proximate lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Jenkens Jr. and Grafton (5964783) as taught by Grafton (6319270) in order to provide an increased percentage of thread surface area for each turn of the anchor, thus providing increased pull-out strength, and a decreased tendency for back-out.

Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Jenkens Jr. and Grafton (5964783) as previously described, and further in view of Jackson (US 6454772).

Art Unit: 3773

The combination of Jenkens Jr. and Grafton (5964783) teaches all limitations of preceding dependent claims 1 and 11, but fails to teach wherein the drive socket has at least one slot for receiving a corresponding protrusion on a driver head. Jackson teaches a threaded surgical implant, comprising a drive socket having a pair of slot tool receivers in order to receive a corresponding protrusion on a driving tool for effective delivery of the device to the tissue.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Jenkens Jr. and Grafton (5964783) with slot tool receivers as taught by Jackson in order to receive a corresponding protrusion on a driving tool for effective delivery of the device to the tissue.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dreyfuss (6652563), and further in view of Grafton (5964783).

Dreyfuss teaches a suture anchor (6) comprising an anchor body (6) having a proximal end, a distal end, and a drive socket (132, Figs. 3 and 6) at the proximal end; a suture eyelet (122 and the most right portion of anchor in Fig. 5 for an eyelet), the suture eyelet is capable of receiving a second, knot-tying suture therethrough the suture eyelet being completely within the anchor body (Fig. 5), wherein the drive socket has at least one slot (Fig. 3) for receiving a corresponding protrusion on a driver head for driving the suture anchor (Fig. 6), wherein the slot terminates distally in a suture hole (where 138 meets 122) provided within the anchor body (slot 132 terminates distall of

122 Fig. 5), the suture hole (where 138 meets 122) is transverse to a longitudinal axis of the anchor body (Fig. 5).

Dreyfuss does not teach a bioabsorbable anchor body or the suture eyelet is insert-molded into the anchor body. Grafton teaches a bioabsorbable (col. 3, Il. 36) suture anchor wherein a suture material is insert molded into the anchor body in order to increase pull out strength of the suture from the anchor body. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Dreyfuss with a bioabsorbable material, a bioabsorbable material is helpful because the suture anchor may not be needed permanently and removal of the anchor is unnecessary. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Dreyfuss with the anchor being bioabsorbable an insert-molded suture loop in order to increase pull out strength of the suture from the anchor body.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/21/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant generally argues the following:

- Jenkins teaches two suture knots and not a "suture eyelet"
- Jenkins does not teach a second knot-tying suture
- Grafton '783 does not teach a suture eyelet

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant, Jenkins teaches a suture evelet as stated above, when the knot of 28 is formed, there is an eyelet for the suture

to pass through, the examiner argues that a knot comprises several eyelets. The examiners position is the applicant does not distinctly claim a second suture and suture knot in the independent claims. Grafton '783 teaches a suture eyelet as shown in Fig. 5. The examiner suggests adding limitations from paragraph 24 of the specification, including the insert-molded suture has an intertwined shape to increase the pullout strength of the suture from the anchor body.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELISSA RYCKMAN whose telephone number is

(571)272-9969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jackie Ho can be reached on (571)-272-4696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MKR /Melissa Ryckman/ Examiner, Art Unit 3773

/(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3773